

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Recent Developments in Chemistry and Biochemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2251
Title of the Manuscript:	Statistical aspects in assessment of chemical loads upon water bodies
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work described in this chapter is detailed and robust which will be useful for chemical load analysis in water bodies. However, there are a number of grammatical errors in the manuscript including the title. The chapter is recommended to be re-checked for grammar and language errors prior to its publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable indicating the content of the chapter. However, the language needs correction. Eg. It may be put as "Statistical aspects in the assessment of chemical loads upon in water bodies"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive and indicative of the contents of the chapter. However, it can be improved through correction of language to enable efficient reading by the readers of the scientific community.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The "Materials and methods" and the "Results and Discussion" section can be divided into sub-sections with appropriate short titles. This will help to improve the organization of the manuscript and enable the readers to understand the flow of the manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The contents discussed in this paper are scientifically robust. The results have been explained in details with proper justification. The significance of the content has also been highlighted properly in this manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references used are very old. Although most of the old references are from landmark papers, it is recommended to include at least 10 references from the last 10 years.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language/ English needs improvement for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	The chapter may be published after minor revisions which includes correction of language/grammer, including latest references and modification of the manuscript with appropriate sub-sections under “materials and methods” and “Result and discussion”.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anindita Deb Pal
Department, University & Country	J.D. Birla Institute, Jadavpur University, India